



# AGC/WSDOT ROADWAY TEAM

## **MINUTES for 12/12/2002 Meeting** AGC Office, Tacoma WA

### **Attending:**

Ray Arnold  
Al Dyer  
David Jones

Dean Moberg  
Jeff Peterson  
Frank Scarsella

Jim Spaid  
Joe Spink  
Gordon Olson

## **Minutes of October 31, 2002 Meeting**

-Distributed copies and no added comments made.

### **Old Business**

Minutes of Other Team Meetings –The Administration Team Minutes from November 15, 2002 were distributed.

#### Environmental Compliance Assurance Procedure for Construction Projects and Activities

Jim Spaid, WSDOT Construction Office handed out the Final procedure that has been endorsed by the Transportation Environmental Permit Accountability Committee (TEPAC). Jim noted that the procedure is intended to document field issues and actions related to permits. Jim pointed out that this effort would document the good efforts as well as the problems. It should function as an Environmental Report Card for the Department. Joe Spink, Wilder Construction was interested in what was expected of Contractors in this process. Jim did not see that it changed anything for the contractor, but suggested the contractor notify the Project Engineer in addition to the Agencies. The procedure documents the process the WSDOT Project Manager needs to follow. Al Dyer, WSDOT Urban Corridors Office asked if this would be coming out as an instructional letter or through the Construction Manual. Jim stated that they are looking at making it an Executive Order.

Ray Arnold noted that the region has also established an internal notification process and are now conducting a pre-contract walk-through of the job to insure permit issues are identified. All contractors present stated that they would like to be involved in the walk-through.

Jim Spaid informed the group that WSDOT is also looking at an Environmental Management System similar to ISO 14000 as a means of keeping track of environmental issues.

#### FYTD Class 06 Equipment Utilization Charts (dump trucks)

Jim handed out the utilization chart for maintenance dump trucks. The chart indicates that maintenance trucks are utilized heavily in the winter months but low in the summer. The Department may be interested in renting these trucks out. The Contractors present were interested in renting their trucks to WSDOT in the winter. There was a general discussion of the differences between the maintenance trucks and contractors' trucks begin. The hauling capacities of the contractors trucks seemed to be significantly larger than that of maintenance trucks. Maintenance trucks needed heavier frames to support snow plow operations. The contractors felt it might be worth exploring further but suggested contracting out the winter activates or discussing this idea with trucking or rental companies rather than Heavy Construction Contractors.

#### PCC Pavement Rahab – New Section 5-01

Jim stated that Section 5-01 and 9-20 are out for review.

Joe Spink noted that the next PCCP retrofit job is already out for bid and that it still made it the contractors responsible to deal the disposal of the grinding slurry. Joe suggested that the Department provide guidance on this issue. Jim noted that there is research being done by the Department to address this issue.

Jeff Peterson commented on the use of mobile mixers. He suggested that the quantities of materials used for dowel bars retrofits lend themselves to job site mixing and should be allowed.

Jeff noted that the specification allows for several different types of materials that might be required when replacing material under PCCP panels that are to be replaced. Jeff stated that not knowing what will be required makes it difficult for the contractor to bid.

Joe suggested that we should allow the use of hydro demolishers to create the slots for dowel bars. Jeff suggested that we define the opening that we want and not specify the method to get the opening.

It was also asked if the cuts for the panel replacements needed to be vertical or is there a tolerance that could be acceptable.

These comments will be taken into consideration as further revisions are made to this new section.

### **New Business**

#### Review of Section 2-09, Structure Excavation (shoring issues)

Jim handed out section 2-09 to the group and asked how we might go about reviewing this section. It was quickly determined that the existing specifications were, for the most part, working well. The issue was whether or not the contractor should be given the option to shore or use the open pit method. All contractors present felt that the existing

specifications are workable and that the contractor should be in control of the means and methods of shoring to meet safety and jobsite requirements. Al Dyer and Ray Arnold presented a few examples where mandatory shoring might be needed. There was a discussion on whether shoring should be paid by lump sum or square foot. Class B items such as water lines, drainage items, etc. tend to vary more than the Class A items and therefore the Class B items are paid by square foot and Class A by lump sum.

It was asked why structure excavation for MSE walls is Class B. It was recommended that structure excavation for MSE walls be changed to Class A, and shoring paid lump sum. Jim stated that we are now looking at incorporating the MSE walls into the Standard Specifications. Jim will bring the proposed MSE specifications to the next meeting for review. The group agreed. A further suggestion related to MSE walls was to consider including backfill as part of the square foot cost for the walls, due to the quantity of backfill material being dependent on the type of MSE wall selected.

#### Section 9-18.12 Revisions

The revised section was handed out. The reflective sheeting requirements are changing; expect this change to occur in April 2003.

#### Materials On Hand (MOH)

It was noted that this has been the best thing that has happened for the suppliers, but it has some pitfalls for the contractor. One of the pitfalls is that when the material arrives on site and corrective work is required the contractor has no good handle to recover from the suppliers. The supplier often has been paid in full and is not motivated to make good on material that may be defective. Gordon Olson suggested withholding a percentage similar to retainage. Joe Spink noted that on electrical MOH item we pay 50 percent at a time.

Jim Spaid suggested that problems or suggested changes related to payment for materials on hand should be directed toward the Admin team.

#### Other Items

Gordon asked what was going on with smoothness specifications. Jim stated that we are still evaluating smoothness and that no final decision has been made. Jim also noted that there is an AASHTO Specification that is being evaluated on the national level. The specifications would pay a bonus starting at an IRI of 60 and reductions would begin at an IRI of 65 for interstate highways and around 75 for other roadways. Further discussions are expected with the Washington Asphalt Paving Association and the Roadway Team before anything is finalized.

### **Other Business**

#### *Discussion Topics*

The following list of topics will be kept as part of the minutes and future agendas to indicate the items that have surfaced as issues for discussion by the team. As each issue is addressed, it may be removed from the list. As new issues are raised, they will be added to the list as a reminder of the things that need discussion:

{Note: Issues that are added will now include the date (11/30/00) they were included on the list so the team can track their longevity}

- Galvanizing of fence products – review of current specs for consistency.
- Testing of storm sewer pipes – differences in the time for low-pressure air testing on non-air-permeable pipe materials.
- Shoulder Rock - further discussion of method of payment.
- Smoothness Specification for ACP - this is an issue of information. A subcommittee of the APAW/WSDOT Joint Task Force is working on the specifics of this issue.
- Longitudinal Wedge Joint
- Roller Speeds
- Testing Storm Sewer Pipe - recent changes in the testing requirements for HDPE pipe have increased the length of time for testing.  
(5/24/01) - What is the background for those changes?  
(9/20/01) - Discussed the duration of the test. Bill G. said why hold it so long when you know within the first few minutes if you have a leak and thus a failing pipe.
- Signal Detector Loops - Suggested the number of bid items could be reduced by bidding loops per each rather than separate bid items for each type of set (for instance, R1, R2, R3, etc. for loop sets of 1, 2 or 3 loops).
- Traffic Control Devices –NCHRP 350
- Paint Applications – What is the time required between the application (Std Spec Section 8-22)

## **Next Meeting**

January 16, 2003

The meetings will be held at the Tacoma AGC office beginning at 8:00am unless otherwise noted.